

Mr. CRISFIELD gave notice that on Monday next, he should move to reconsider the vote of the Convention on the article adopted in the report of the committee on the Legislative department abolishing imprisonment for debt.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BRENT of Baltimore, rose to a personal explanation. He had noticed in No. 10 of the Register of Debates that in some remarks made by Mr. Crisfield, that gentleman made him (Mr. B.) use this language, to wit: that "he (Mr. Brent,) thought that the true basis of representation was *wealth and population*." Now, he wished his disclaimer to be entered upon the Register of Debates, that he had never expressed any such opinion, as that population and wealth were the two great principles upon which the basis of representation rested. He had not said this, but he did say that he went for population and nothing but population as the true basis. He had spoken of Southern Constitutions, and had observed that taxation and population went together; but, he repeated, he had never advocated *wealth as a principle of representation*.

Mr. CRISFIELD said the reporter is certainly not responsible for the error, and he felt it due to that officer to say so. His (Mr. C's) attention was called to the matter yesterday by the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Brent.) His recollection was now that the gentleman's argument was based upon population exclusively. He thought it quite probable that he (Mr. C.) misapprehended or rather misstated what the gentleman from Baltimore city had said. His recollection was according to the gentleman's recollection. He (Mr. C.) did not intend to misrepresent him, and very cheerfully corrected the mistake.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

The Convention then resumed the consideration of the day, being the report submitted by Mr. Bowie, Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The question pending before the Convention on yesterday being on the second branch of the amendment offered by Mr. Crisfield to the 9th section of the report—

Mr. RIDGELY moved to amend the first branch of the amendment adopted on yesterday, by adding at the end thereof the following proviso:

"Provided, nevertheless, that Baltimore county court may hold its sittings within the limits of the city of Baltimore, until provision shall be made by law for the location of a county seat within the limits of said county proper, and the erection of a court house and all other appropriate buildings for the convenient administration of justice in said county."

Mr. R. said he had an amendment to offer to the first branch of the 9th section of the substitute, which, if now in order, he proposed to explain. The amendment does not touch the merits of the question, but simply has for its object to provide against a serious difficulty in which the section, as passed, involves Baltimore

county. The first branch of the section arranged the judicial districts in such a manner as to detach Baltimore county from its former connection with Baltimore city, and to unite that county with Harford and Cecil as a judicial district. This separation, demanded as it is by the mutual interests of city and county, is I believe acquiesced in by both delegations, yet we seriously object to the union of Harford and Cecil with Baltimore county, as a judicial district, regarding Carroll county as the natural and appropriate association with Baltimore county for such a purpose. Many reasons, conclusive, in my judgment, in favor of this opinion, might be urged, but the classification of the districts being already decided, it is not now in order. My purpose is a different one. The detachment of Baltimore county from Baltimore city, and its union with Harford and Cecil, has put Baltimore county out of the judicial district in which its court house and present seat of justice are located. It will be apparent, therefore, that having no county seat or court house within the county proper, that without some constitutional provision we shall be left without any legal capacity to hold a court, until the legislature make some provision to meet this emergency.

I have, therefore, prepared an amendment, to come in at the end of the classification of the districts, to meet the difficulty, which I now offer with the concurrence of the entire delegation from the county.

Mr. CHAMBERS said he did not think this subject a legitimate one, to form a part of a Constitution. He did not wish to interfere in the matter; it was local, it was true, and some provision he supposed, would be made for disposing of such subjects as were not proper to form a part of organic law in their nature, in the form of a schedule. He suggested to the gentleman from Baltimore county the propriety of deferring the subject to that end.

Mr. RIDGELY said, let it be now adopted; if true it is a local matter, but its adoption, or such provision, has become absolutely necessary by the arrangement made of the judicial districts. It seemed to him that the Constitution had produced this difficulty, it was peculiarly appropriate that the relief necessary should be provided in the Constitution; he also thought he had offered the amendment in the appropriate place, being in immediate connection with the subject proposed to be amended.

Mr. HOWARD. Let the gentleman from Baltimore begin with some other subject.

Mr. RIDGELY. Yes, this is too important for the people of Baltimore county to be deferred and perhaps crowded out; besides, there is a committee on the subject of arranging the details of the Constitution under appropriate heads, which will give this proposition a proper position, should be found out of place in its present connection.

Mr. CHAMBERS remarked that he did not desire to say any thing in relation to the particular question before the Chair; but the discussion had brought into view a matter quite worth